

## II. REMARKS

1. Claims 1 through 18 remain in the application.

2. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 are patentable over the combination of Kikinis (US 5,220,521) and Bowen (US 5,644,338).

The combination of Kikinis and Bowen fails to disclose or suggest that the electronic input device is configured to be moved from the second state into the third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device, in a second direction being different than the first direction, as recited by claim 1.

The combination of Kikinis and Bowen also fails to disclose or suggest that in the second state, the flexible input means adopts a partly extended spatial configuration, and at least part of the functionality of the electronic input device is available for a user, also as recited by claim 1.

The Examiner correctly points out that Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest these features. Applicants respectfully submit that Bowen fails to supply these missing elements.

Bowen discloses a keyboard with only two positions: open (Bowen; Fig. 1; column 6, line 16) and closed (Bowen; Fig. 4; column 7, lines 4-6). Moving from one position to the other position is done either by sliding or folding the keyboard.

Thus, Bowen fails to teach a third position or state associated with the keyboard. The portion of Bowen cited by the Examiner (column 13, line 65 - column 14, line 4) fails to provide a

sliding movement from a second state to a third state. Rather, it only describes in detail the folding mechanisms disclosed in Figs. 31-37. These figures and the associated portions of the description disclose a way to implement folding the keyboard so that it can be moved between its two positions.

Further, Bowen fails to teach that at least part of the functionality of the electronic input device is available for a user in the second state (i.e. the closed position). The portions of Bowen cited by the Examiner (column 8, lines 26-32; Fig. 17) fail to disclose or suggest this feature. As can be seen in Fig. 17, the keyboard is folded closed and the display is further folded on top of the keyboard. Thus, it is obvious by simply looking at Fig. 17 that the functionality of the keyboard is not available for the user in the closed state. Even though col. 8, lines 28-29, state that the computer can operate while the keyboard is in the closed position, this is not the same as the user being able to operate the keyboard in the closed state. Operation of the keyboard in the closed state is impossible, as shown by Fig. 17. Rather, it is obvious that the phrase "the computer can operate" refers to the computer being electrically and mechanically connected while the keyboard is in the closed position, since this is one of the main objects of the reference (Bowen; column 2, lines 50-61). However, simply because the computer may be operable does not mean that the functionality of the keyboard is available to the user.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Kikinis and Bowen.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and therefore are also patentable over the combination of Kikinis and Bowen.

2. Claims 8-11 are patentable over Kikinis in view of Bowen, and further in view of Kinya et al. (JP 04-178684, hereinafter "Kinya").

Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Kinya fails to provide the features lacking in Kikinis and Bowen, that is, that the electronic input device is configured to be moved from the second state into the third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction.

Kinya also fails to disclose or suggest that in the second state the flexible input means adopts a partly extended spatial configuration and at least part of the functionality of the electronic input device is available for a user.

Kinya discloses a flexible display medium that may be rolled up into a housing. However, like the other cited art, Kinya fails to disclose or suggest an electronic input device having three states. Kinya also fails to disclose or suggest the movements described in claim 1 for moving from the first to second and second to third states. Furthermore, Kinya fails to disclose or suggest a partly or fully extended spatial configuration of the flexible input means, where at least part of the functionality of the device is available in the partly extended configuration, and the available functionality is extended in the fully extended configuration.

Because the combination of Kikinis, Bowen, and Kinya fail to disclose or suggest these features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kikinis, Bowen, and Kinya fails to render claims 8-11 unpatentable.

3. Claims 12-15 are patentable over the combination of Bowen, and Kinya, further in view of Furuya et al. (JP 06-164440, hereinafter "Furuya").

Like Kikinis, Bowen, and Kinya, Furuya fails to disclose an electronic input device having three states. Furuya also has no disclosure related to the movements described in claim 1 for moving from the first to second and second to third states. In addition, Furuya fails to disclose or suggest a partly or fully extended spatial configuration of the flexible input means, where at least part of the functionality of the device is available in the partly extended configuration, and the available functionality is extended in the fully extended configuration.

Because the combination of Kikinis, Bowen, Kinya, and Furuya all fail to disclose or suggest these features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kikinis, Bowen, Kinya, and Furuya fails to render claims 12-15 unpatentable.

4. Claims 16, 17, and 18 are patentable over the combination of Kinya and Bowen.

Claims 16, 17 and 18 are directed to method claims related to an electronic input device with features similar to those of claim 1. As mentioned above, Kinya fails to disclose or suggest an electronic input device having three states. Kinya also fails to disclose or suggest the movements described in claim 1 for moving from the first to second and second to third states. Furthermore, Kinya fails to disclose or suggest a partly or fully extended spatial configuration of the flexible input means, where at least part of the functionality of the device is available in the partly extended configuration, and the

available functionality is extended in the fully extended configuration.

For the same reasons as stated above, Bowen fails to disclose or suggest the features lacking in Kinya. Bowen fails to teach a third position/state associated with the keyboard and fails to teach at least part of the functionality being available for a user in the second state.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 17, and 18 are patentable over the combination of Kinya and Bowen.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.